

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

OA 449/2015

New Delhi this the 24th day of January, 2019

**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. S.N.Terdal, Member (J)**

Chet Ram Meena, Aged 22 Years,
(Fresh Appointment)
S/o Shri Samarth Lal Meena,
R/o Vill. Garh Sawai Ram,
Tesh. Reni, Distt. Alwar (Raj.). ... Applicant

(By Advocate: Ms. Sonika Gill for Mr. Yogesh Sharma)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through the
General Manager, Northern Railway,
Baroda House, New Delhi.
2. The Chairman.
Railway Recruitment Cell
Lajpat Nagar-1, New Delhi-110024.
3. The Assistant Personnel Officer,
Railway Recruitment Cell,
Lajpat Nagar-1, New Delhi-24. ... Respondents

(By Advocate: Mr. R.V.Sinha)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Hon'ble Mr. S.N.Terdal, Member (J):

We have heard Ms. Sonika Gill for Mr. Yogesh Sharma, counsel for applicant and Mr. R.V.Sinha, counsel for respondents, perused the pleadings and all the documents produced by both the parties.

2. In this OA, the applicant has prayed for the following reliefs:

"(i) That the Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to pass an order of quashing the rejection information dt. 12.12.2014 available on the web-site (Ann.A/1) by which case of the applicant has been rejected, declaring to the effect that the same is illegal, arbitrary and discriminatory and consequently, pass an order directing the respondents to issue the appointment order to the applicant for suitable posts at an early date with all the consequential benefits

from the due date i.e. from the date of issuance of the appointment letters to the similarly situated persons.

(ii). Any other relief which the Hon'ble Tribunal deem fit and proper may also be granted to the applicant along with the costs of litigation."

3. The crucial question arising in this case is whether the rejection of the appointment of the applicant on the mismatch in the handwriting/signature of the applicant available on the Application Form, ORM Sheet, D.V. papers etc. is sustainable at the final stage of the recruitment process.

4. The relevant facts of the case are that the applicant had applied for Group 'D' post in response to the Employment Notification No.220-E/Open Mkt./RRC/2012 dated 30.08.2012 published in the Employment News issued by the respondents. He had successfully cleared the written examination and physical efficiency test. He was provisionally found eligible for documents verification. But, however, at the time of documents verification, the respondents found that there is handwriting/signature mismatch on the relevant papers referred to above and on that basis the candidature of the applicant was rejected.

5. The counsel for the applicant vehemently submitted that no opportunity was given to the applicant to explain the mismatch in the handwriting/signature, as such there is violation of principle of natural justice and on that ground he has prayed for the above stated relief.

6. The respondents in their counter affidavit stated that the admission of the candidate at every stage of the recruitment process is purely provisional, subject to satisfying the prescribed condition and they have also stated that one of the conditions is that the candidate

should fill up the application form in his/her own handwriting as per the conditions of the recruitment, and that during the examination of the applicant's case it was decided by the respondents (Northern Railway) to get the expert advice from the Forensic Document Expert duly nominated by the Ministry of Railways for the purposes of reference to matching the hand-writing/Signature on the relevant papers. The said Documents Expert after examining the relevant documents with reference to the applicant advised that the hand-writing/signature of the applicant do not match and accordingly his case was rejected by the competent authority. They have also submitted that as the competent authority after getting the Expert Advice have taken a conscious decision to reject the case of the applicant for appointment, the OA of the applicant should be dismissed. He has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India & Another Vs. Sarwan Ram & Another** (SLP (C) No. 706/2014 and also the judgment of CAT/Chandigarh Bench in the case of **Deepak Vs. Union of India and another** (OA No. 1355/HR/2013) and also the judgments of CAT Principal Bench in the case of **Devendra Kumar Vs. The General Manager(NR) and Others** (OA No. 2356/2014), **Pradeep Kumar Vs. UOI Through the General Manager (NR) and Others** (OA No. 4143/2013 with connected OAs.), **Rahul Mavai Vs. Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Railways and Others** (OA 32/2016) and **Papendra Singh and Ors Vs. Union of India through the General Manager(NR) and Ors.** (OA 2619/2015), **Hajaru Deen Khan Vs. Union of India through the General**

**Manager(NR) and Ors.(OA 440/2015), Praveen Kumar Vs.
Railway Recruitment Cell through the Chairman (OA 2061/2015).**

7. It is also observed that at the request of the counsel for the applicant, this Tribunal directed the respondents to produce the original records for the perusal of the Tribunal. Accordingly the respondents produced the original records at the time of hearing. From the perusal of the original records, we are of the opinion that the decision taken by the respondents is based on objective and reasonable examination and assessment and is neither arbitrary nor unreasonable.

8. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and also in view of the various judgments of the Tribunal, relied upon by the counsel for the respondents and in view of the facts and circumstances referred to above, the contention of the applicant cannot be countenanced, and the OA is dismissed. No order as to costs.

**(S.N.Terdal)
Member (J)**

**(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)**

'sk'

...